

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 02584 01 OF 02 252106 Z

71

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 ADP-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 INR-10 L-03 NEA-10

NSAE-00 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 GAC-01 TRSE-00 MBFR-03

SAJ-01 USIE-00 INRE-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 SS-15 NSC-10

ACDA-19 IO-12 AEC-11 RSR-01 /134 W
----- 042986

O R 252000 Z MAY 73

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 254

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS 2997

USCINCEUR

USDOCOSOUTH

USLOSACLANT

USNMR SHAPE

USDEL SALT TWO II

AMEMBASSY HELSINKI

AMEMBASSY VIENNA

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 2584

E. O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR: MAY 24 SPC REVIEW OF GUIDELINES

HELSINKI FOR USDEL MPT

VIENNA FOR USDEL MBFR

REF: STATE 99729

SUMMARY: FOLLOWING ARE PARA BY PARA HIGHLIGHTS OF SPC DISCUSSION
OF PROPOSALS BY U. S. AND OTHERS FOR REVISIONS IN DRAFT GUIDELINES
IN REF A. SEPTTEL CONTAINS REVISED TEXT OF PARAS ONE THROUGH TWELVE
WHICH EMERGED FROM MEETING. END SUMMARY.

1. REFERRING TO MAY 23 COUNCIL DISCUSSION, U. S. REP SAID GUIDELINES
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 02584 01 OF 02 252106 Z

CANNOT BE DIVORCED FROM NEED FOR ALLIES TO TAKE DECISIONS ON
OUTCOMES, AND COULD IN FACT BE USED TO SHARPEN ISSUES AND
FACILITATE THESE DECISIONS. GUIDELINES TEXT SHOULD NOT SUBMERGE
DIFFERENCES MERELY TO GIVE APPEARANCE OF ALLIED CONSENSUS WHERE

NONE EXISTS, BUT RATHER TO BRING DIFFERENCES INTO RELIEF. WITH THIS AIM IN MIND, U. S. HAD NUMBER OF SUGGESTED CHANGES, WHICH COULD BE BRACKETED IF OTHERS DID NOT AGREE. (U. S. REPS THEN CIRCULATED PROPOSALS IN REF A.) U. S. DID NOT FIND A GREAT NUMBER OF ISSUES DIVIDING ALLIES, BUT THE MAJOR POINTS OF DIFFERENCE SHOULD BE BROUGHT TO THE SURFACE AND AIRED IN THE COUNCIL. IF THEY COULD NOT BE RESOLVED THERE, THEY SHOULD BE SUBMITTED TO MINISTERS IN JUNE. BELGIAN REP CAUTIONED THAT GUIDELINES SHOULD NOT BE WRITTEN IN SUCH CONCRETE FORM AS TO PRECLUDE FLEXIBILITY IN NEGOTIATIONS. U. S. REP REPLIED THAT GUIDELINES SHOULD BE SEEN AS SHARPENING FOCUS FOR DECISIONS ON OUTCOMES, WHICH ARE NECESSARILY EXPRESSED IN CONCRETE TERMS. NEGOTIATING TACTICS ARE A SEPARATE MATTER.

2. FOLLOWING POINTS WERE MADE IN PARA BY PARA REVIEW OF TEXT THAT ENSUED:

A. U. S. PROPOSAL FOR NEW PARA ONE: MOST SPC REPS FELT THAT U. S. LANGUAGE REFERRED PRINCIPALLY TO CONSTRUCTION OF A NEGOTIATING POSITION AND TACTICS FOR PRESENTING IT. U. S. ACQUIESCED IN NORWEGIAN SUGGESTION THAT U. S. POINTS BE MADE IN CHAIRMAN'S COVER NOTE FORWARDING DOCUMENT TO COUNCIL (AND ULTIMATELY TO MINISTERS).

B. PARA ONE: CANADIAN AND FRG REPS CONTINUED TO FAVOR ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE ON POSITIVE OBJECTIVES OF MBFR (TEXT OF SOVIET INTENTIONS, CONTRIBUTION TO DETENTE, ETC.). THEY AGREED TO COLLABORATE ON LANGUAGE.

C. PARA 2: U. S. PROPOSALS REOPENED DEBATE ON WHETHER REDUCTIONS SHOULD BE ACCOMPANIED BY OR LEAD TO CONSTRAINTS IN AREAS BEYOND REDUCTIONS AREA. U. S. REP SAID WE HAD GRAVE RESERVATIONS ABOUT OPENING UP MBFR TO AREAS BEYOND CENTRAL EUROPE. DESPITE THIS, WE ARE WILLING TO STUDY SUGGESTIONS OF OTHERS FOR A WIDER CONSTRAINTS AREA, BUT WE NEED TO HAVE CONCRETE PROPOSALS AND CANNOT DECIDE THE ISSUE IN THE ABSTRACT. NETHERLANDS REP SAID POSSIBILITY OF CONSTRAINTS IN SOVIET WESTERN MD'S SHOULD BE KEPT OPEN. NETHERLANDS DID NOT DISCOUNT FACT THAT SOVIETS WOULD HAVE COUNTERPROPOSALS IN WESTERN EUROPE AND EVEN EASTERN U. S. ALLIES SHOULD NOT SIMPLY RULE OUT POSSIBILITIES FOR CONSTRAINTS

SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 02584 01 OF 02 252106 Z

OR NON- CIRCUMVENTION IN NATO AREA OF EUROPE, BUT SHOULD EXAMINE THEM ON THEIR MERITS. FRG REP CONCURRED. NETHERLANDS REP ADDED THAT CONSTRAINTS/ NON- CIRCUMVENTION AREA COULD EXTEND BOTH NORTHWARDS AND SOUTHWARDS OF REDUCTION AREA. NORWEGIAN REP SAID CONSTRAINTS/ NON- CIRCUMVENTION BEYOND REDUCTION AREA WOULD BE NECESSARY TO MAINTAIN UNDIMINISHED SECURITY, AND NORWAY DID NOT RULE OUT BEING INCLUDED IN SUCH LIMITATIONS. TURKISH AND ITALIAN REPS OBJECTED TO EXTENSION OF CONSTRAINTS AREA TO SOUTHERN FLANK, BUT DID NOT COMMENT ON POSSIBILITY OF NON- CIRCUMVENTION FORMULA AFFECTING THEIR TERRITORIES. UK REP TURNED AROUND ORIGINAL U. S. THOUGHT TO HAVE OTHERS SUGGEST CONCRETE PROPOSALS FOR CONSTRAINTS BEYOND REDUCTION ZONE, AND CHALLENGED U. S. REP TO PROVIDE RATIONALE FOR OBJECTIONS TO

REDEPLOYMENT CONSTRAINTS (OR NON- CIRCUMVENTION PROVISIONS TO SAME EFFECT) IN ALLIED AREAS BEYOND CENTRAL EUROPE. U. S. REP PROMISED TO SEEK FURTHER GUIDANCE ON THIS POINT, BUT ON PERSONAL BASIS SUGGESTED LIMITATIONS ON SIXTH FLEET AND ITS MOVEMENTS WOULD BE A PROBLEM. PRESENT TEXT OF PARA TWO OF GUIDELINES GIVES U. S. SOUTHERN FLANK PREFERENCE AS SECOND ALTERNATIVE AND FRG LANGUAGE SUPPORTED BY MOST OTHERS AS FIRST PREFERENCE.

D. PARA 5: MOST REPS SYMPATHIZED WITH U. S. SUGGESTION TO DELETE, BUT FRG INSISTED ON RETAINING IT IN BRACKETS.
COMMENT: WE BELIEVE AN EVENTUAL COMPROMISE INCORPORATING INTO PARA SIX THE LAST PART OF PARA FIVE WILL PROVE ACCEPTABLE TO ALL. THIS IS NOT A MAJOR ISSUE. END COMMENT.

SECRET

NMAFVVZCZADP000

PAGE 01 NATO 02584 02 OF 02 252114 Z

71

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 ADP-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 INR-10 L-03 NEA-10

NSAE-00 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 GAC-01 TRSE-00 MBFR-03

SAJ-01 USIE-00 INRE-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 SS-15 NSC-10

ACDA-19 IO-12 AEC-11 RSR-01 /134 W

----- 043133

O R 252000 Z MAY 73

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 255

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS 2998

USCINCEUR

USDOCOSOUTH

USLOSACLANT

USNMR SHAPE

USDEL SALT TWO II

AMEMBASSY HELSINKI

AMEMBASSY VIENNA

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 2584

E. PARA 7: UK INTRODUCED NEW LANGUAGE WHICH NOW APPEARS AS SECOND BRACKETED ALTERNATIVE EXPLAINING THAT PARITY MERELY IN MANPOWER LEVELS WOULD NOT BE A TEST OF PARITY IN CAPABILITIES, FOR WHICH EQUIPMENT WAS AT LEAST AS IMPORTANT AS CRITERION. BELGIAN, IMS, AND DUTCH REPS AGAIN SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS IN UK LANGUAGE, BUT BASICALLY SUPPORTED IT. U. S. REP AGAIN DISTINGUISHED BETWEEN " COMMON CEILING" AND " PARITY" AND SAID THAT A COMPARISON OF FORCE CAPABILITIES IN NEGOTIATIONS MIGHT WORK TO NATO' S DISADVANTAGE. COMMENT: FACT THAT U. S. OPTIONS

DO NOT LEAD TO PARITY IN EQUIPMENT LEVELS (E. G., TANKS) IS LIKELY TO REMAIN AN ISSUE IN FURTHER WORK ON BOTH GUIDELINES AND OPTIONS, AND WOULD APPRECIATE ARGUMENTATION TO USE ON POINT. END COMMENT.

F. PARA 8: FIRST BRACKETED ALTERNATIVE IS NEW SUGGESTION INTRODUCED BY NETHERLANDS. THIS VERSION INCORPORATES U. S.

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 02584 02 OF 02 252114 Z

LANGUAGE IN REF A. SECOND ALTERNATIVE IS UK LANGUAGE CIRCULATED AT MAY 23 NAC. THIRD ALTERNATIVE REPRESENTS OLD TEXT (USNATO 2461), WHICH ITALIAN REP CONTINUED TO FAVOR. FOURTH ALTERNATIVE IS BELGIAN PROPOSAL.

G. PARA 9: ALTHOUGH CURRENT DRAFT DOES NOT SHOW BRACKETS, BELGIAN AND GREEK REPS PREFERRED THAT GUIDELINES MERELY LIMIT REDUCTIONS TO TEN PERCENT IN OVERALL NATO STRENGTH IN REDUCTION AREA, RATHER THAN TO TEN PERCENT OF STATIONED FORCES AND TEN PERCENT OF INDIGENOUS FORCES. BELGIAN REP THOUGHT MORE GENERAL GUIDELINE WOULD ALLOW MORE NEGOTIATING FLEXIBILITY. OTHERS PREFERRED MORE PRECISE LANGUAGE, I. E. BECAUSE IT REPRESENTED VOLUNTARY RESTRAINT PLACED BY U. S. ON REDUCTIONS OF ITS OWN FORCES.

H. PARA 10: SINCE U. S. HAD DEMURRED FROM OFFERING GUIDELINE ON EQUIPMENT, NETHERLANDS REP STATED THAT HIS DELEGATION WOULD DEVELOP PROPOSAL. COMMENT: DUTCH DELOFF INFORMED US ON MAY 25 THAT NETHERLANDS IS CONTEMPLATING STATEMENT THAT " U. S. FORCES SHOULD BE PERMITTED TO STOCKPILE EQUIPMENT IN THE REDUCTION AREA," WITH POSSIBLE ADDITION OF PHRASE " IN CONNECTION WITH A COMMON CEILING OR PERCENTAGE PARITY APPROACH" TO MAKE CLEAR THAT THIS WOULD NOT NECESSARILY BE THE CASE IN MIXED PACKAGE APPROACH. DUTCH REP EXPLAINED THAT OMISSION OF ANY REFERENCE TO SOVIET EQUIPMENT IS BECAUSE NETHERLANDS DOES NOT BELIEVE IT ESSENTIAL THAT ALL SOVIET EQUIPMENT BE WITHDRAWN, AS LONG AS U. S. EQUIPMENT IS RETAINED IN THEATER. END COMMENT.

I. PARA 11: OTHERS SUGGESTED " THE MBFR PROGRAM" VICE " MBFR" TO REPRESENT U. S. POSITION ON THIS POINT, LEST THERE BE CONFUSION IN DRAWING DISTINCTION BETWEEN " MBFR" AND " REDUCTIONS". U. S. REP DID NOT OBJECT TO THIS SUGGESTION.

J. PARA 12: FRG REJECTED REVISION IN SECOND BRACKETED ALTERNATIVE. PROTRACTED DISCUSSION OF THIS PARA LED NOWHERE, AND LANGUAGE REMAINS AS IT WAS, WITH ONLY CHANGE BEING THAT LAST TWO SENTENCES ARE NOW A SEPARATE PARA.

3. DURING MAY 25 SPC DISCUSSION, SEVERAL REPS REVERTED TO POINTS IN THESE PARAS AND ADDITIONAL CHANGES WERE MADE. NEW TEXTS OF THESE PARAS ALONG WITH NEW TEXTS OF PARAS 13-17 FOLLOW SEPTEL.

4. AS A RESULT OF DUTCH COMPLAINT IN MORNING NAC ON MAY 25 ABOUT TRANSITION IN VIENNA FROM DISCUSSION OF AGENDA TO
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 02584 02 OF 02 252114 Z

COMMUNIQUE DRAFTING, MAY 28 NAC WILL DEAL WITH DEVELOPMENTS
AT MBFR INITIAL TALKS AS WELL AS WITH GUIDELINES.

MCAULIFFE

SECRET
NMAFVVZCZ
<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 02 APR 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 25 MAY 1973
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: boyleja
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1973NATO02584
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: N/A
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1973/newtext/t19730558/abqcdzsm.tel
Line Count: 222
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 5
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: STATE 99729
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: boyleja
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 20 AUG 2001
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <20-Aug-2001 by boyleja>; APPROVED <19-Sep-2001 by boyleja>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: MAY 24 SPC REVIEW OF GUIDELINES
TAGS: PARM, NATO
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS
USCINCEUR
USDOCOSOUTH
USLOSACLANT
USNMR SHAPE
SALT TWO II

HELSINKI
VIENNA

Type: TE

Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005